

Appl. No. 10/617,366
Response dated February 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated Aug. 7, 2006

REMARKS

The drawings were objected to. Applicant has deleted “container scanning equipment” from the claims, and thus it is respectfully submitted that no changes to the drawings are necessary.

Claims 74-81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants have deleted “container scanning equipment” from the claims, and respectfully submit that all claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 74-88 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would know what an “automatic” hitch is.

Regarding claim 81, claim 80, on which it depends, does not require using the yard tractors. It is possible to perform the method of claim 80 without ever using the yard tractors. Therefore, claim 81 does further limit the subject matter of claim 80. The same arguments relate to claim 88. It is respectfully that all claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 74, 75, and 78-81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce, Landow, and Hareyama et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Specifically, none of these references shows or describes bi-directional draw bar multi-trailers. Rotating luffing boom cranes which can move up or down rails do not constitute bi-directional draw bar multi-trailers. Since all claims contain the limitation of bi-directional draw bar multi-trailers, none of the claims are rendered obvious by the references of record. As pointed out in the specification at page 18, lines 4-12, the bi-directional draw bar multi-trailers are useful in that allow a very narrow platform to be used (because the trailers are bi-directional, they can be pulled from either end without the need for them to be turned around).

Claim 77 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce, Landow, Hareyama, and Lovell. Claim 77 is respectfully submitted to be patentable for the reasons advanced above.

Appl. No. 10/617,366
Response dated February 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated Aug. 7, 2006

Claims 82-88 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce and Landow. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Since neither of these references disclose bi-directional draw bar multi-trailers or the use of bi-directional draw bar multi-trailers, it is respectfully submitted that these references, even in combination, do not render obvious the claimed invention.

Claim 84 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce, Landow, and Lovell. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 84 is believed to be patentable for the reasons advanced above in support of the other claims.

Claims 89-92 have been added to claim the next best pick system disclosed in the patent application. It is respectfully submitted that this next best pick system is patentable, as it is a novel and non-obvious departure from the way that unloading of vessels occurs in the prior art. The support for the next best pick system has been added to the specification from the paper (specifically from pages 6, 30, and 31) attached to US Provisional Patent Application No. 60/394,988, which was incorporated by reference in the present patent application as filed. Therefore, no new matter has been added to the application.

Applicants respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants respectfully petition the Commissioner for any extension of time necessary to render this paper timely.

Please charge any fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0694.

Respectfully submitted,

/smn/

Appl. No. 10/617,366
Response dated February 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated Aug. 7, 2006

Seth M. Nehrbass, Reg. No. 31,281
e-mail: SethNehrbass@gsnn.us
Charles C. Garvey, Jr., Reg. No. 27,889
Gregory C. Smith, Reg. No. 29,441
Brett A. North, Reg. No. 42,040
Jacqueline M. Daspit, Reg. No. 36,779
GARVEY, SMITH, NEHRBASS & NORTH, L.L.C.
PTO Customer No. 22920
3838 N. Causeway Blvd., Suite 3290
Metairie, LA 70002
Tel.: (504) 835-2000
Fax: 504-835-2070

P:\ClientFiles\98\982\98246.1P\98246-1P-RES3.wpd